DRAFT HUNTERS POINT NAVAL SHIPYARD
BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE CLEANUP TEAM
MEETING MINUTES

August 25, 2011

These minutes summarize the meeting of the Hunters Point Naval Shipyard (HPNS) Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Cleanup Team (BCT) held on August 25, 2011, at the CH2M HILL offices in Oakland, California. Participants in the meeting included the BCT, which is made up of representatives from the United States (U.S.) Department of the Navy (Navy), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC), and the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The City of San Francisco (City), their consultants, the Lennar team of developers, and Navy consultants also attended the meeting. These minutes describe the key points, decisions, and action items agreed to at the meeting. A list of attendees is included as Attachment A. The document review table is included as Attachment B. Action items from the meeting are included as Attachment C.

1.0 Navy Business/Action Items (Keith Forman, Navy)

Keith Forman (Navy, Base Environmental Coordinator [BEC]) began the meeting with introductions. Craig Cooper (USEPA), Ryan Miya (DTSC), and Ross Steenson (RWQCB) were present to represent the regulatory agencies involved on the project.

Action Items:

- The Navy will provide the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) with model parameters and types of models being run at Sites 7 and 18. *In Progress. Mr. Yantos stated that the Navy has prepared the dose modeling package and it is currently in review. The Navy will send out the package by September 1, 2011, to CDPH and follow it up with a meeting. Mr. Forman added that there might not be enough travel budget for the Navy to attend the meeting at the CDPH offices but they will discuss this at a later date. The Navy thinks it would be best to meet with CDPH during the week starting September 12, 2011. Mr. Yantos will look into which date is the most convenient for the meeting with CDPH. Mr. Forman requests that USEPA also be in attendance at this meeting between CDPH and the Navy. In addition, Amy Brownell with the City would like a copy of the dose modeling package when it is sent to CDPH.*

- Provide Mike McGowan information regarding cancer risk for radiological contamination that falls within the risk range of 10^{-4} versus 10^{-6} and how action levels compare to the 10^{-6} risk level. *In progress. Mr. Yantos noted that Mr. McGowan wanted a greater explanation of risk in the executive summary of the radiological reports but he was hoping that Mr. McGowan would submit additional comments on this subject as clarification. Mr. McGowan explained that he was looking for clarification with respect to the radiological Cancer Risk threshold and why it differs from the acceptable Cancer Risk threshold for the CERCLA cleanup. Mr. Yantos stated that they would revise the RTCs to explain why Cancer Risk of* 10^{-4} *is acceptable for the radiological program and*

will revise the executive summaries in the radiological reports to provide a more simple explanation of the risk numbers for the public to review.

- Develop estimate for mass of creosote removed from the San Francisco Bay. *In Progress. Mr. Forman mentioned the Ms. Jackie Dunn (Navy) had worked on this estimate but were having a hard time quantifying the amount of creosote in the wood. Mr. Miya stated that the overall purpose of this action item was to help the Navy provide additional information to the public concerning amount of creosote removed from the environment..*

- CirclePoint will meet with Jackie Lane (USEPA) and provide community contact list used for setting up the introduction of the Community Information Manager (CIM) meetings. *Complete. Mr. Forman noted that they got a return mailing from Leon Muhammad and will stop contacting him if his address has changed. Ms. Brownell recommended calling him to see if he has a new address.*

- Navy will discuss Submarine Pens or Dry Docks 5 through 7 with Laurie Lowman (Navy) to see why they have historically been included on maps showing them as radiologically impacted when they were not identified in the Historic Radiological Assessment Report. *In Progress. Mr. Forman will continue to follow up with Ms. Laurie Lowman to see what needs to be included in the radiological screening activities.*

2.0 Radiological Update (Chris Yantos, Navy)

Mr. Forman began the radiological program update and summarized the Crisp Road/Parcel E sanitary sewer and storm drain removals and building surveys. Mr. Forman said that the Navy is waiting on free release letters from CDPH for Building 810 and 414 and the Navy is waiting on the CDPH confirmation sample request for the Building 701 site. The Navy has been trying to get in touch with CDPH to address some of these outstanding items. Mr. Miya noted that CDPH is likely to request confirmation samples at Building 701 and 704 and possibly for Building 414.

The Navy is currently drafting response to comments on the Draft Final Status Survey (FSS) for Building 704 and the Draft FSS for Installation Restoration (IR)-04 Scrap Yard is in Navy Radiological Affairs Support Office (RASO) review. The Draft UC-3 Remedial Action Completion Report (RACR) is anticipated for submittal on October 14, 2011.

The sanitary sewer and storm drain removal began in Parcel C on January 4, 2011 and 40 percent of the parcel is complete. Mr. Forman added that the excavation soil is going to radiological Screening Yards 3 and 4. To date, 14,140 linear feet of sanitary sewer and storm drain lines have been removed. Thirteen of the survey units have received backfill approval. Six of the survey units are complete and the remaining units are in process and 11 survey units are currently being surveyed and sampled.

Mr. Forman summarized the Parcel C building surveys. The Navy issued Draft FSS reports for Buildings 214 and 271 during the previous week. The Navy has completed surveys of Buildings 203, 241, and 272, and the data is under internal review. The North Pier radiological survey activities are beginning because the pier demolition work is complete. The demolition of non-impacted Building 234 was completed on August 18, 2011.

Mr. Forman noted that former Building Foundation 503, which is the area currently occupied by Building 606, was removed down to a depth of 6 feet below the surface when Building 606 was constructed. This excavation would have removed any radiologically impacted soil. Therefore, there will be minimal impacts to tenants in Building 606. Mr. Cooper asked if they have the historic drawings of the sanitary sewer system in this area. Mr. Bill Dougherty (TTEC) stated that they have the drawings and the sanitary lines have been verified in the field. The excavated soil from former Building 503 was used in the WA-36 area and this area is being screened for radiological impacts.

The sanitary sewer and storm drain line removal commenced in the Parcel E 500-series buildings and building sites on July 12, 2011, and is approximately 30 percent complete. To date, 6,060 linear feet of sanitary sewer and storm drain lines were removed. The Navy received, by barge, 50,000 tons of import material for use as backfill. RASO approved task-specific plans (TSPs) for Building Sites 503, 507, 508, 509, and 517. Mr. Forman summarized the field work at the Parcel E 500-series buildings and building sites. The site preparation activities are continuing, the Navy is conducting radiological surveys of the Building 503 site soil, the Navy completed surveying of former Buildings 509 and 517 concrete foundations, the Navy is continuing to perform material and equipment (M&E) surveys in Building 521, and the Navy is sorting debris and soil from Building 506 and 520.

Mr. Forman said that the TSP is being revised for the Gun Mole Pier and the South Pier. All exposed soil areas have been surveyed and the Navy is demolishing the building slabs and scanning the soil beneath. The utility vaults and other "original" concrete pads from the buildings will be scanned in situ. Three Draft Survey Unit Project Reports (SUPRs) will be submitted to regulatory review following backfill activities at the site. The draft version of the Building 274 FSS is due to the BCT in September 2011.

The Navy is awaiting review and concurrence from the CDPH on the B-140 technical memorandum and FSS. Mr. Miya thinks CDPH will be moving forward with the Building 140 Discharge Channel Report. He thinks CDPH wants a meeting to discuss the technical memorandum and how the site got to this point and alternatives that were originally on the table. This will help them to decide if they need to survey the building or not. Mr. Forman asked if the Navy should expect two letters for Building 140 sites. Mr. Miya responded that the letter from CDPH for the discharge channel is being prepared, so the Navy should expect two letters from CDPH for the site. The Draft SUPR, the last Parcel B SUPR, for survey unit (SU)-186 was submitted to the regulatory agencies for comment on July 25, 2011. The draft Parcel B RACR will be submitted to the regulatory agencies after regulatory review of the TU-186 SUPR. The Navy is preparing responses to the regulatory comments on the draft Parcel G RACR. Mr. Miya will inform CDPH that the SU-204 Draft SUPR will be coming into review. SU-204 was backfilled on August 10, 2011, a Draft SUPR is under development for this work and the results will be incorporated into the Parcel G Final RACR. The UC-1/UC-2 RACR was issued final on March 2, 2011, and the Navy is awaiting a letter of concurrence. Mr. Forman noted that they are waiting for letters of concurrence from USEPA on the UC-1/UC-2 RACR. Mr. Cooper noticed that the UC-1/UC-2 RACR is not on the list of upcoming document submittal dates. Mr. Forman and Mr. Cooper requested that reports be left on this list until the regulatory agencies have provided concurrence.

Mr. Forman discussed the IR 7/18 modeling update. A meeting was held with DTSC, CDPH, and the Navy in Sacramento, California, on June 8, 2011. Mr. Forman mentioned that CDPH had conducted their post remediation scan of IR 7/18 and did not find elevated levels of radiological contamination at the site. The Navy received comments on the dose model and the Navy has revised the modeling and portions of licensed exemption package text based on those comments. Mr. Cooper noted that Mark Ripperda had attended that meeting and a copy of the changes should be sent to him. The Navy would like to have a follow-up meeting with CDPH in September 2011. Mr. Forman noted that the Navy is helping out the City by doing this modeling so that the City can pursue a license exemption package. Mr. Miya noted that if CDPH can't do the meeting in September then they should think about scheduling the meeting in October 2011.

Ms. Brownell commented to Mr. Miya that she was concerned about how one of CDPH's comments on the Parcel E-2 Proposed Plan was worded and asked that he give them feedback on this comment.

3.0 Polychlorinated Biphenyl Hot Spot Area Time Critical Removal Action (Chris Dirscherl, Navy)

Mr. Dirscherl with Ms. Lara Urizar (Navy) provided an update on the polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) hot spot time critical removal action (TCRA). Mr. Dirscherl pointed out the areas of excavation on a figures shown during the presentation. Tiers 3 and 5 excavation began in August 2010. Tier 3 has been 100 percent excavated to a depth between 3 and 10 feet below ground surface (bgs) and confirmation samples have been collected. The final condition survey was completed on August 16, 2011, and sample results are pending. The next step is submittal of a final conditions survey package to RASO for review. There has been no over-excavation required in the Tier 5 grids. Mr. Cooper asked why the final condition survey is still pending. Ms. Urizar responded that the site has been cleaned up for lead and PCBs but they are still pending results for radiological samples.

The Navy began excavation of Tier 2 on October 19, 2010. Excavation activities were halted in December 2010 through mid-April 2011. One hundred percent of grids in Tier 2 have been excavated, sampled, and backfilled with clean sand. Over-excavation was required in six grids. Over-excavations were completed with the exception of a Grid 177 sidewall. The constuction access road currently prevents over-excavation of the Grid 177 sidewall. The sidewall will be overexcavated after the geotechnical investigation.

Tier 1 commenced excavation on May 11, 2011. Approximately 51 percent of the Tier 1 grids have been excavated, sampled, and backfilled. The Navy has received 92 percent of collected confirmation sample results, the remaining sample results are pending. Currently, two grids require over-excavation. Ms. Urizar asked Ms. Ulrika Messer (Shaw Group) what the current schedule is for overexcavation of the two remaining grids. Ms. Messer responded that they will complete Tier 1 within the next 2 weeks and they will pursue any contaminats that still need to be overexcavated at that point. The Navy presented a table during the presentation showing the confirmation sample results exceeding radiologial release criteria. All samples that exceeded the release criteria, exceeded it for Strontium-90, except for one sample that exceeded criteria for Radium-226. The Navy also presented a table with descriptions of radiological commodities that had been excavated at the site. Mr. Miya asked if they are able to identify what quadrant within

the grid the commodities came from. Ms. Urizar stated that they can track it back to the 25-square-foot grid quadrant. The presentation showed numerous photographs of the radiological screening activities at Tier 1.

The Navy began implementing material potentially presenting an explosive hazard (MPPEH) acceptance sampling procedures on July 5, 2011. The project is using a global positioning system (GPS) to locate 183 randomly generated 3- by 3-foot grid cells on each screening pad. An unexploded ordinance (UXO) technician investigates all metal responses and removes all metal greater than or equal to 20 millimeters before backfilling. Quality control is done by inspecting 20 percent of all cells and if an object greater than 20 millimeters is found; a thorough review of procedures is conducted with the UXO technicians. In addition, an independent third party also inspects 20 percent of the grid cells and if they find an object greater than 20 millimeters, then the entire pad may need to be screened again. The Navy has reduced screening at Tier 1 material because 10 pads have been inspected without any MPPEH findings. To date, 12 material documented as safe (MDAS) items have been encountered and no munitions of explosive concern (MECS) has been found on the site. The Navy has screened and cleared 17 pads or approximately 3,400 cubic yards of soil so far.

To date, 117 roll-off bins were filled with low-level radiological waste (LLRW). Approximately 5,500 cubic yards of non-LLRW were transported by ITSI for offsite disposal. Water from Frac Tank #2 was used for dust control and then the frac tank was demobilized. The Navy continued erosion control and fence line inspections and continued collecting water samples outside of the turbidity curtain. The Navy continued air monitoring and have posted the air monitoring results on the Navy Web site.

The Navy will continue the following field actions; implementing acceptance sampling for MPPEH clearence, excavting and over-excavations, recieve RASO approval on final conditions survey package for Tier 3, and re-commence Tier 5 excavation. The Navy will continue hot-spot excavation and soil screening through December 2011, demobalize in January 2012, and submit the draft RACR in March 2012.

Mr. McGowan mentioned that site restoration activities are scheduled to begin during the winter and asked if this would have an effect on the site. Ms. Urizar noted that they do site restoration activities the entire year and would likely come back out to finish the activities during the spring time.

4.0 Parcel C RU-C5 Groundwater Treatability Study Final Results (Hamide Kayaci, Navy)

Mr. Forman introduced Ms. Tamzen Macbeth (CDM) and noted that knowledge gained on this project would be implemented at other groundwater remediation sites. Ms. Macbeth provided some background on the project. Building 134 was historically used for machine operations and contained a degreaser and a sump for seperating chlorinated solvents from sludge. The contaminants at the site are primarily chlorinated benzenes and ethenes, which were released in the subsurface where they exist as dense non aqueous phase liquid (DNAPL). The Navy conducted a treatability study to evaluate a multi-component treatment strategy for the source area and dissolved phase plume. Ms. Kayaci showed some pictures of the site and a three-dimensional figure of the contaminants in the subsurface below the degreaser and sump.

Contaminats addressed at this site include 1,2 Dichlorobenzene (DBA), 1,3 DBA, 1,4 DBA, Chlorobenzene, Trichloroethene (PCE), Tetrachloroethene, cis-Dichloroethene (DCE), and vinyl chloride.

The treatability study objectives included Treatment Components (TCs) 1 and 3 hydraulic fracturing and EHC (patented combination of controlled-release carbon and zero valent iron) injections, establish conditions to accelerate in situ degradatio of the volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and demonstrate 80 percent reduction of chlorinated VOCs parent compounds in groundwater compared to the baseline concentrations. TC 2 involved thermal conduction heating and the objectives are to evalute TCH for accelerating residual DNAPL removal and reduce chlorinated VOC concentrations in soil by at least 90 percent.

Pre-desing characterization included installation of 22 borings and eight confirmation soil borings with DNAPL screening and sampling. The Navy estimated that there was approximately 300 pounds of VOCs present in the source area with most of the contaminations resulting from tetrachloroethene and 1,2 DBA. Total mass in groundwater was estimated at 0.89 pound.

TC 1 targeted the source area and TC 3 targeted the dissolved-phase plume. Hydraulic fracturing was used to enhance distribution of EHC, which couples in situ bioremediation and zero valent iron. The Navy conducted the farcture well installation and EHC dosing. Tiltmeter geophysics were used to conduct a detailed geophysical analysis and soil sampling to evaluate effectiveness at achieving desired amendment distribution. Analtyical data was collected from two monitoring events (1 and 4 months post-fracture) to evaluate treatment performance.

The Navy advanced six source fracture wells and six plume fracture wells. The radius of amendment distribution was 15 to 20 feet from fracture location. They emplaced 13,419 pounds of amendment in source wells and 17,126 pounds in plume wells. Mr. Forman asked if emplacing that many pounds of amendment is normal when compared to other similar sites across the U.S. Ms. Macbeth stated that the dose of amendment is calculated based on the amount of contaminant in the subsurface. In addition, Ms. Macbeth added that once you fracture, the tragetory of the fracture is based on the geophysics in the subsurface. Ms. Macbeth noted that they did have daylighting at some of the fracture locations where the amendment came back up to the surface because of the subsurface geology or subsurface structures. This happened when the fracture hit the footing of the building or encountered backfill material.

The fracturing was tracked using tiltmeter geophysics which provides an estimate of frac extent, how the fracs are centered at the borhole, and how the frac propagates. The Navy analyzed the tiltmeter data from 60 of the 87 fractures and modeled those fractures for all boreholes except one.

The TC 1 and TC 3 treatment volume was established 18 to 23 feet from the fracture boreholes. The Navy was able to achieve geochemical conditions conducive to reductive dechlorination was established in the treatment zone. For TC 3, only limited impact was observed at two of the well locations.

TC 2 involved thermal conduction heating of the source zone. The Navy presented a map showing how the thermal conduction heating system was laid out at the site and a graph showing mass removal over the time that the source area was heated. Mr. Copper asked how the Navy

was sure that the area of influence was capturing all the vapors. Ms. Macbeth stated that they had several pressure measurement stations both in and outside the treatment area to maintain a negative pressure and ensure that they have a pressure gradient drawing into the treatment area. Mr. Cooper asked if there were any rogue fractures. Mr. Forman responded that these are micro fractures and the pressure from the earth will self seal the fractures after treatment. The Navy presented several graphs showing the chlorinated benzenes and ethenes reductions over time for individual well locations. The groundwater contaminant mass was estimated at 0.89 pound prior to treatment and 0.36 pound following treatment. The soil contamination was estimated at 291 pounds prior to remediation and 22 pounds following remediation. While treatment was considered successful, some of the contaminat daughter products remain in the environment.

The Navy decide to do LactOil injections to decrease concentrations of daughter products. LactOil is a combination of lactate (35 percent) and microemusified vegetable oil (45 percent). The LactOil injections were used as a polish to in combination with the TC 3 technology. Ms. Macbeth noted that biological degredation gets jump started by the lactate and the vegtable oil ensures that the degredation continues to occur over 1 to 2 years. The injections occurred in May 2011. The LactOil injections increased the amount of carbon at the well locations where fracturing wasn't as successful. After the injections, there was a uniform decline indicating degredation is occurring. The Navy will need to continue to track concentrations in these wells to show how effective the LactOil injections were.

The Navy presented post injection data collected from soil vapor samples. The soil vapor samples demostrated values higher than the screening criteria. Ms. Macbeth noted that groundwater temperaturs are at approximately 70 degrees Celsius (ºC) and are declining about 10ºC per month. The temperatures are high and the thermal cap is in place and not yet at equilibrium. As the temperatures come down the biological dechlorination will increase.

Conclusions drawn from TC 1 and TC 3 include fracture extent that ranged from 2.5 to 89 feet with an average extent from the borehole of 18 to 23 feet in the source area and 13 to 24 feet in the dissolved-phase plume. EHC was emplaced as discrete sheets with diffusion of amendments to groundwater effective at creating reducing within the source area and dissolved plume treatment areas. For TC 1 there was a 24 to 99.9 percent reduction in PCE and 1,2-dichloroethane (DCA) and 5 to 57 percent reduction in 1,2-, 1,3-, 1,4-DCB. PCE reduced to ethene through cis-DCE and vinyl chloride and the dichlorobenzenes predominately decreased to chlorobenzene with little benzene present 4 months after injection.

Conclusions from TC 2 showed little to no reductive dechlorination observed at temperatures below 70ºC. TC 2 was effective at removing greater than 90 percent of the total VOC mass in soil, with the lowest removal observed for 1,2-DCB (86 percent) and highest for PCE (99.9 percent). Parent compounds in groundwater were reduced 50 to 93 percent for the DCBs except at one well location. Reductive daughter product concentrations reduced 61 to 99 percent for chlorobenzene/benzene except at two wells were it increased. The post-treatment polish from emplaced carbon and EHC will be evaluated over the next year.

The Draft Treatability Study completion report will be submitted to the BCT on September 30, 2011, and the Final Treatability Study will be issued in December 2011.

Mr. McGowan noted that at the beginning of the presentation, the goals listed included removing 80 percent of the contaminant mass in groundwater and 90 percent of the DNAPL. It looks like the Navy got 90 percent of the DNAPL but only 60 percent reduction in groundwater. Ms. Macbeth noted that groundwater only shows a small piece of the project. The mass in soil is much greater than the mass in groundwater because of the low soluability of the contaminants. So it takes just a small amount of residual mass in soil to create residual contaminant concentrations in groundwater. In addition, due to the high temperatures in the soil, that contaminant mass is preferrentially in groundwater because the soluability is higher at high temperatures. Mr. McGowan stated that it seems that setting a goal for groundwater is futile since there is so little contamination there to begin with and anything remaining in soil can move into the groundwater phase. He noted that the Navy might not want to put up a goal on the first slide that they can't achieve. He also noted that the conclusions slide was a data table and instead the Navy should present the text of the conclusions from the project. Ms. Macbeth noted that she thinks the project is on track to achieve the site goals over the next year. Mr. Miya asked Ms. Macbeth if she thinks enough of the DNAPL contamination was removed from the subsurface to make a long-term difference at the site. Ms. Macbeth clarified that she thinks the DNAPL has been removed from the site. The remaining soil mass can act as a source of contamination in the system. Since 99 percent of the remaining contaminats in soil is 1,2-DCB and the other 0.9 percent is 1,4-DCB, she is expecting that this contamination will persist longer than other types of chemicals found at the site. She thinks that the site will achieve project goals in roughly 5 years. Mr. Miya asked her what affect will this treatment have on the soil gas concentrations in the area because the regulators are using soil gas as a driver for the institutional controls on HPNS. Will this treatability study result in soil vapor concentrations that are below action levels for institutional controls? Ms. Macbeth stated that based on the soil gas action levels, she believes that it would based on the current data that they have. Currently, the soil gas concentrations are coming as a result of concentrations in groundwater.

As the subsurface cools and the microbiable degredation increases, she thinks that the rates will increase even more than what they saw during treatment since subsurface conditions will become optimal over the next year. However, she can't guess when degredation will begin or how much mass will stay in soil as compared to groundwater. Mr. Miya noted that there alot of different things that need to come back to have equilibrium in the subsurface, he wondered how long would it take to reach this. Ms. Brasaemle noted that even if it takes 5 to 6 months for the temperatures to come down in the subsurface, they would still want the Navy to monitor the site for several years. Mr. Forman stated that the length of time of the monitoring would depend on the monitoring concentrations at the site. Mr. McGowan noted that the Navy needed to add this information to their conclusions, that they won't know if site objectives were achieved for several years. Mr. Forman noted that the soil vapor question, might be addressed better at some time in the future.

5.0 Early Transfer Schedule Update (Keith Forman, Navy)

Mr. Forman noted that the Navy need more time for finishing the Final Parcel E Feasibility Study and this has cascadeing effects on the schedule. It appears that based on the current dates in the table, that Parcels E and F and going to take the longest to finish. Ms. Brownell noted that implementing the remedial design for Parcel E-2 will take many years. Parcel UC-3 is impacted by the Parcel E schedule because the site doesn't exist until after the Parcel E Proposed Plan is

issued. At that point, Parcel UC-3 becomes a stand-along site and will be conveyed long before Parcel E. There is slight delay on the remedial design for Parcel C because the characterization studies need to be completed prior to issuing the final remedial design. Ms. Brownell asked why the Finding of Suitability to Transfer (FOST) and Finding of Suitability for Early Transfer (FOSET) dates are still "To Be Determined (TBD)." Ms. Lundgren (KCH) noted that Ms. Deb Theroux (Navy) thinks there is too much uncertainty at this time to put it in a schedule for the BCT meeting.

6.0 Community Involvement Update (Keith Forman, Navy)

Mr. Forman, noted that they had a very long meeting the previous night at the community meeting and Mr. Robinson was kind enough to stay longer and answer questions from community members. Mr. Robinson noted that his conversations continued for an hour after the meeting. Mr. Robinson provided an update on the community involvement activities and the path forward regarding community involvement. They are continuing to sign up people for bus tours on August 26 and 27, 2011. They currently have 40 people signed up for August 26 and 76 people for August 27, 2011.

Each bus tour will be approximately 1.5 hours and picked up a San Francisco City College or the Asian Pacific American Community Center (APACC) and John King Senior Center. There will be translators provided on the buses.

Mr. Forman and Mr. Robinson met with the San Francisco Tabernacle Group and Michael Hammon and both groups requested a bus tour at a later date which the Navy will try to do for them. In addition, they met with Eric Smith, who would like Mr. Forman to join him on his radio show on KPOO again. They also met with Paul Schriener of Archamedes Banya, which will be a Russian bath house adjacent to the shipyard.

Mr. Robinson noted that they sent our invitations to meet with Jaron Brown, Nyese Joshua, and Robert Van Houten but they did not respond to his invitations. USEPA will ask Mr. Brown and Ms. Joshua why they haven't taken the opportunity to meet with Mr. Robinson.

The last public meeting was on August 24 at APACC and they discussed the Parcel E-2 Proposed Plan, which went smoothly. The upcoming meetings include the September 20, 2011 Proposed Plan meeting at the Alex Pitcher Room. The final meeting will be December 7, 2011, at the YMCA, which will discuss the year in review. There will be a Navy presentation on the Parcel E-2 Proposed Plan to the San Francisco Community Advisory Committee (CAC) on October 17, 2011. Ms. Brownell asked if the Navy had recieved a request from the San Francisco Board of Supervisors. Mr. Forman responded that Navy senior managment is discussing this meeting with USEPA. Mr. Copper noted that he doesn't believe that USEPA is planning on attending the meeting. Ms. Brownell noted that the proposed date of the meeting is October 24, 2011. Ms. Brownell noted that it is not the Board of Supervisors intent to put the Navy and USEPA on the spot at the meeting rather it's to educate people about what's going on.

Ms. Brownell noted that they had a meeting with the CAC subcommittee the preivous night and one of the main concerns with the generation of jobs in the community. They will be contacting the Navy to discuss job creation. Mr. Forman noted that they are setting up one of these meeting by the end of the year. The Navy will not do a meeting until there are jobs available.

Ms. Brownell asked that on the bus tours Mr. Forman should restate that HPNS is safe and they have the air monitoring to show for it.

Mr. Forman asked the regulators how many would attend the bus tours. Mr. Miya will be on the Friday tours and Mr. Steenson will do the tours on Saturday. The regulators should meet the Navy at the front of the Base at 9:30 a.m. before they pick up the public.

USEPA has requested a media tour on September 1, 2011. Mr. Cooper noted that the press release for the Proposed Plan should follow and be issued by September 2, 2011.

7.0 Action Items/Future Meetings (Keith Forman, Navy)

The next BCT meeting will be held on September 22, 2011, at the CH2M HILL Offices in Oakland, California. Action items are included as Attachment C.

ATTACHMENT A:

HUNTERS POINT NAVAL SHIPYARD
MEETING ATTENDANCE SHEET

Topic: BCT Meeting
Location: CH2M Hill Offices
155 Grand Avenue
Oakland, CA
Date/Time: August 25, 2011 / 10:00 a.m.

Organization	Name	Phone Number	E-Mail Address	Present
Navy	Keith Forman	619-532-0913	keith.s.forman@navy.mil	X
	Melanie Kito	619-532-0787	melanie.kito@navy.mil	
	Lara Urizar	619-532-0960	lara.urizar.ctr@navy.mil	X
	Hamide Kayaci	619-532-0930	hamide.kayaci.ctr@navy.mil	X
	Chris Yantos	619-532-0952	christopher.yantos.ctr@navy.mil	X
	Simon Loli	619-532-0782	simon.loli.ctr@navy.mil	
	Laurie Lowman	757-887-7650	laurie.lowman@navy.mil	
	Matt Slack	757-887-4212	matthew.slack@navy.mil	
	Zack Edwards	757-887-4692	zack.edwards@navy.mil	
	Frank Fernandez	510-749-5936	franklin.d.fernandez@navy.mil	
	Jarvis Jensen	757-887-4483	jarvis.jensen@navy.mil	
	Adam Zwiebel	510-749-5947	adam.zwiebel@navy.mil	
	Shane Wells	510-749-5922	robert.s.wells@navy.mil	
	Jackie Dunn	619-532-0777	jacqueline.dunn@navy.mil	X
	Bob Hunt	619-532-0962	robert.a.hunt.ctr@navy.mil	
	Chris Dirscherl	619-532-0932	chris.dirscherl@navy.mil	X
	Deb Theroux	619.532.0919	debra.theroux@navy.mil	
USEPA	Craig Cooper	415-947-4148	cooper.craig@epa.gov	X
	Jackie Lane		Lane.jackie@epa.gov	X
DTSC	Ryan Miya	510-540-3775	rmiya@dtsc.gov	X
Water Board	Ross Steenson	510-622-2445	rsteenson@waterboards.ca.gov	X
	Kathleen Low		klow@waterboards.ca.gov	X
CDPH	Jeff Wong	510-620-3423	jeff.wong@cdph.ca.gov	
	Tracy Jue	916-324-4808	tracy.jue@cdph.ca.gov	
	Kurt Jackson			
	Larry Morgan			
	Steve Hsu	916-440-7940	steve.hsu@cdph.ca.gov	X
City of SF	Amy Brownell	415-252-3967	amy.brownell@sfdph.org	X
	Sigrida Reinis	415-955-9040	sreinis@treadwellrollo.com	X
Geosyntec	Jeff Austin	415-218-0027	jasustin@geosyntec.com	
BVHP/Lennar	Steve Rottenborn	408-458-3205	srottenborn@harveyecology.com	
Tech Law Inc., US*EPA contractor*	Karla Brasaemle	415-762-0566	kbrasaemle@techlawinc.com	X

Organization	Name	Phone Number	E-Mail Address	Present
Navy Contractors				
Tetra Tech EM, Inc.	Tim Mower	313-312-8874	tim.mower@ttemi.com	
Tetra Tech EC, Inc.	Bill Dougherty	415-216-2731	bill.dougherty@tetratech.com	X
Sealaska Environmental Services	Lauren Cason	619-564-8329	lauren.cason@sealaska.com	
	Doug Peeler		doug.peeler@sealaska.com	
CE2	Bruce Rucker	925-400-4586	rucker@ce2corp.com	X
	John Copland	925-463-7301	copland@ce2corp.com	
Kleinfelder	Gary Goodemote	510-628-9000	ggoodemote@kleinfelder.com	
	Gabriel Fuson	510-774-4115	gfuson@kleinfelder.com	
	Eric Johansen	619-694-5516	ejohansen@kleinfelder.com	
KCH	Leslie Lundgren	415-541-7110	leslie.lundgren@ch2m.com	X
	Jamie Hamm	415-819-4971	Jamie.hamm@ch2m.com	X
ERRG	Doug Bielskis	925-726-4119	doug.bielskis@errg.com	
	John Sourial	415-848-7103	john.sourial@errg.com	
ITSI	Jim Schollard	925-946-3107	jschollard@itsi.com	
	Brett Womack	925-250-8077	bwomack@itsi.com	
	Ken Leonard		kleonard@itsi.com	
Jonas and Associates	Gilbert Yousif	415-559-8232	gyousif@jonasinc.com	
Shaw Group	Wayne Akiyama	925-288-2003	wayne.akiyama@shawgrp.com	
	Ray Schul	415-822-1224	raymond.schul@sahwgrp.com	
	Ulrika Messer	619-241-9451	ulrika.messer@shawgrp.com	
Battelle	Cannon Silver	619-424-7606	silverc@battelle.org	
	John Hardin	619-574-4827	hardinj@battelle.org	
MACTEC	Alfonso Ang	415-278-2108	aang@mactec.com	
	Jeff Fenton			
	Ray Hendry	303-807-4421	lrhendy@mactec.com	
	Alfonso Ang	415-278-2108	aang@mactec.com	X
URS	Jerry Zimmerle	714-433-7738	jerome.zimmerle@urscorp.com	
Circle Point	Lawrence McGuire	415-227-1100	l.mcguire@circlepoint.com	X
	Matt Robinson	510-378-5511	m.robinson@circlepoint.com	X
CDM	Tamzen Macbeth	208-569-5147	macbethtw@cdm.com	X
	Matt Brookshire	858-268-3383	brookshirems@cdm.com	
Arc Ecology	Mike McGowan	415-643-1190	mikemcgowan@arcecology.org	X
BCDC	Rafael Montes	415-352-3670	rafaelm@bcd.ca.gov	X

ATTACHMENT B: HPNS DOCUMENT REVIEW TABLE- DOCUMENT REVIEW COMPLETED

			Submittal	Expected Date		Agency Submittal of Comments			
Item	**Parcel**	**Document Name**	**Date**	**for Comments**	**Notes**	**EPA**	**DTSC**	**RWQCB**	**City of SF**
1	E	Draft IR03 Work Plan	5/12/11	6/17/11		6/17/11	6/17/11	6/29/11	6/16/11
2	E-2	Final Landfill Gas Monitoring Report for January - March 2011	5/12/11	n/a					
3	E	Final Parcel E Groundwater Treatability Study Technical Report	5/18/11	n/a					
4	UC-3	Final Survey Unit Project Reports (SUPR) for Units 166, 169, 170, and 172 Work Package 37	5/19/11	n/a					
5	E-2	Draft Proposed Plan to BCT	5/23/11	7/11/11		7/8/11	6/29/11		7/11/11
6	B	Draft TM- Unrestricted Radiological Release of Building 140 Including the Suction Channel and Discharge Piping	5/23/11	6/22/11		6/3/11	6/22/11		6/16/11
7	UC-3	Final Survey Unit Project Reports (SUPR) for Units 180, 181, 185 and 188, Work Package 38	5/24/11	n/a					
8	E	Draft Final Status Survey Results, Building 704 Site	5/25/11	6/24/11					
9	UC-3	Final Survey Unit Project Reports (SUPR) for Units 173, 174, 175, and 176, Work Package 39	5/26/11	n/a					

ATTACHMENT B: HPNS DOCUMENT REVIEW TABLE- DOCUMENT REVIEW COMPLETED (CONTINUED)

Item	Parcel	Document Name	Submittal Date	Expected Date for Comments	Notes	Agency Submittal of Comments			
						EPA	DTSC	RWQCB	City of SF
10	Basewide	Final CIP	5/27/11	n/a					
11	C	Final In Situ Anaerobic Bioremediation Treatability Study Completion Report,RU C-1, Building 253	6/8/11	n/a					
12	Basewide	Semiannual Groundwater Monitoring Report	6/21/11	n/a					
13	UC-3	Final Survey Unit Project Reports (SUPR) for Units 177, 178, 179, 182, and 183, Work Package 40`	6/24/11	n/a					
14	E-2	ARARs Request Letter For Shipshielding Action Memorandum	6/27/11	7/29/11			8/10/211		
15	UC-3	Final Survey Unit Project Reports (SUPR) for Units 184, 187, 189, and 190, Work Package # 41	6/28/11	n/a					
16	D-2	Draft Final FOST	6/29/11	7/29/11			7/29/11	7/25/011	7/29/11
17	Basewide	Basewide Stormwater Annual Report	6/29/11	n/a					
18	B,D-1,G,UC-2	Draft Soil Gas Survey Tech Memo	7/1/11	8/10/11	Comment Period Extended	8/17/11	8/16/11	8/11/11	8/15/11
19	B	Revised Final Remedial Design Package Parcel B (Excluding IR Sites 7 and 18)	7/5/11	n/a					

ATTACHMENT B-1: DOCUMENTS CURRENTLY UNDER REVIEW

			Submittal	Expected Date		Agency Submittal of Comments			
Item	Parcel	Document Name	Date	for Comments	Notes	EPA	DTSC	RWQCB	City of SF
1	E	Draft Final Parcel E Feasibility Study	7/8/11	8/11/11			8/23/11		
2	E-2/B	Final Work Plan for Geotechnical Investigation at Parcel E-2 (IR Site 01/21) and Parcel B (IR Site 26)	7/8/11	n/a					
3	Basewide	Final Survey Unit Project Reports Abstract for Sanitary Sewer and Strom Drain Removal Conducted After January 1, 2011	7/8/11	n/a					
4	B,D-1,G	Draft RACR with CSR for B,D-1, and G Hot Spots to BCT	7/15/11	8/15/11			8/19/11	8/10/11	8/19/11
5	E	Final Final Status Survey Results, Building 701 Site	7/19/11	8/19/11					
6	B	Final Technical Memorandum to Support Unrestricted Radiological Release of Building 140 Including the Suction Channel and Discharge Piping.	7/20/11	8/22/11					
7	B,C	Draft Survey Unit 186 Project Report, Parcels B and C Sanitary Sewer and Storm Drain Removal Project	7/25/11	8/26/11					
8	F	Final Radiological Data Gap Investigation Work Plan	8/1/11	n/a					
9	E-2	Draft Final Proposed Plan (BCT)	8/2/11	8/12/11		8/19/11		8/4/11	8/11/11
10	B	Final - Petroleum hydrocarbon Site Closeout Report Parcel B, Vol 1 and 2	8/2/11	n/a					

ATTACHMENT B-1: DOCUMENTS CURRENTLY UNDER REVIEW (CONTINUED)

			Submittal	Expected Date		Agency Submittal of Comments			
Item	**Parcel**	**Document Name**	**Date**	**for Comments**	**Notes**	**EPA**	**DTSC**	**RWQCB**	**City of SF**
11	E-2	Final Quarterly Gas Monitoring Report to BCT (For April through June 2011)	8/10/11	n/a					
12	E-2	Final Annual Landfill Cap Operation and Maintenance Report for 2010-2011	8/17/11	n/a					
13	C	Draft Final Status Survey Results, Building 214	8/17/11	9/16/11					
14	C	Draft Final Status Survey Results, Building 271	8/19/11	9/19/11					
15	E	Final IR03 Work Plan	8/24/11	9/2/11	Concurrence				

ATTACHMENT B-2: DOCUMENTS FOR UPCOMING REVIEW (NEXT THREE MONTHS)

			Submittal	Expected Date		Agency Submittal of Comments			
Item	Parcel	Document Name	Date	for Comments	Notes	EPA	DTSC	RWQCB	City of SF
1	C	Draft TPH Work Plan	8/30/11	30 days from submittal date	Date Tentative				
2	C	Draft Pre-RA Initial Characterization Work Plan (RU C1, RU C4, RU C5)	9/6/11	30 days from submittal date	Date Tentative				
3	C	Draft RU C2 Pre Remedial Action (RA) Initial Characterization Work Plan	9/6/11	30 days from submittal date	Date Tentative				
4	E	Draft Final Parcel E FS Radiological Addendum	9/6/11	45 days from submittal date	Date Tentative				
5	B,D-1,G	Final RACR for B,D-1, and G Hot Spots	9/7/11	n/a	Date Tentative				
6	E-2	Final Proposed Plan (Public)	9/7/11	n/a	Date Tentative				
7	B,D-1,G,UC-2	Final Soil Gas Survey Tech Memo	9/9/11	n/a	Date Tentative				
8	B	Draft RACR for IR 7 and 18	9/15/11	30 days from submittal date	Date Tentative				
9	C	Draft RU C5 GWTS Completion Report	9/30/11	n/a	Date Tentative				
10	E-2	Draft TCRA Action Memo for Shipshielding	9/30/11	30 days from submittal date	Date Tentative				
11	G	Final Rad RACR	10/6/11	n/a	Date Tentative				

ATTACHMENT B-2: DOCUMENTS FOR UPCOMING REVIEW (NEXT THREE MONTHS, Continued)

			Submittal	Expected Date		Agency Submittal of Comments			
Item	Parcel	Document Name	Date	for Comments	Notes	EPA	DTSC	RWQCB	City of SF
12	UC-3	Draft Rad RACR	10/14/11	30 days from submittal date	Date Tentative				
13	C, E	Draft Soil Vapor Sampling Work plan	10/26/11	30 days from submittal date	Date Tentative				
14	C	Final RU-C2 Pre Remedial Action Initial Characterization Work Plan	10/31/11	n/a	Date Tentative				
15	E-2	Final Quarterly Gas Monitoring Report to BCT (For July through September 2011)	11/2/11	n/a	Date Tentative				
16	E	Final Parcel E Feasibility Study	11/14/11	n/a	Date Tentative				
17	E-2	Draft TCRA Work plan for Shipshielding Area	11/15/11	30 days from submittal date	Date Tentative				
18	B	Final RACR for IR 7 and 18	11/18/11	n/a	Date Tentative				
19	C	Draft Final Pre-RA Initial Characterization Work Plan (RU C1, RU C4, RU C5)	11/19/11	30 days from submittal date	Date Tentative				
20	C	Draft Final RU_C5 GWTS Completion Report	11/23/11	30 days from submittal date	Date Tentative				

ATTACHMENT C: HPNS BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE CLEANUP TEAM ACTION ITEMS

Item No.	Action Item	Person Authoring the Action Item	Due Date	Person/Agency Committing to Action Item	Resolution Status
New Action Items					
1	Ryan Miya will talk to CDPH about comments on the Parcel E-2 Proposed Plan	Ryan Miya, DTSC		Ryan Miya, DTSC	
Outstanding Action Items					
2	Revise RTCs to Mike McGowan explaining why Cancer Risk of 10^{-4} is acceptable for Rad when 10^{-6} is used elsewhere at HPNS. Also include this information in future executive summaries	Navy		Yantos	.
3	Develop estimate for mass of creosote removed from Bay	Navy		Navy	
4	Describe rad impacted designation areas on landside of Berths in Parcel B	Navy		Navy	.